From: US Supreme Ct - Justia Opinion Summaries
To: Kutches, Brandon (SHF)
Subject: Listen to the Cases Argued This Week: Emulex Corp. v. Varjabedian, Iancu v. Brunetti, North Carolina Department of Revenue v. The Kimberley Rice K ...
Date: Friday, April 19, 2019 12:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

If you are unable to see this message, click here to view it in a web browser.

Justia Argument Summaries

US Supreme Court

The Court heard oral arguments in the following cases this week:

Emulex Corp. v. Varjabedian

Iancu v. Brunetti

North Carolina Department of Revenue v. The Kimberley Rice Kaestner 1992 Family Trust

Parker Drilling Management Services, Ltd. v. Newton

McDonough v. Smith

United States v. Davis

☐ **Emulex Corp. v. Varjabedian** (Argued 04/15/2019)

Did the Ninth Circuit correctly hold, in contrast to the holdings of five other federal appellate courts, that Section 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 supports an inferred private right of action based on the negligent misstatement or omission made in connection with a tender offer?

Advocates:
Gregory G. Garre, for the petitioners
Morgan L. Ratner, for the United States, as amicus curiae
Daniel L. Geyser, for the respondents

☐ **Iancu v. Brunetti** (Argued 04/15/2019)

Does Section 2(a) of the Lanham Act, which prohibits the federal registration of “immoral” or “scandalous” marks, violate the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment?

Advocates:
Malcolm L. Stewart, for the petitioner
John R. Sommer, for the respondent

☐ **North Carolina Department of Revenue v. The Kimberley Rice Kaestner 1992 Family Trust** (Argued 04/16/2019)

Does the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibit states from taxing trusts based on trust beneficiaries’ in-state residency?

Advocates:
Matthew W. Sawchak, for the petitioner
David A. O'Neil, for the respondent

☐ **Parker Drilling Management Services, Ltd. v. Newton** (Argued 04/16/2019)

Does the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act permit the application of state

law only when there is a gap in the coverage of federal law, or whenever state law pertains to the subject matter of the lawsuit and is not preempted by inconsistent federal law?

Advocates:
Paul D. Clement, for the petitioner
Christopher G. Michel, for the Unted States, as amicus curiae, in support of petitioner
David C. Frederick, for the respondent

☐ **McDonough v. Smith** (Argued 04/17/2019)

Was the Second Circuit correct in holding, contrary to the holdings of a majority of other circuits, that the statute of limitations for a Section 1983 claim based on fabrication of evidence in criminal proceedings begins to run when the defendant becomes aware of the tainted evidence and its improper use?

Advocates:
Neal Kumar Katyal, for the petitioner
Jeffrey B. Wall, for the United States, as amicus curiae
Thomas J. O'Connor, for the respondent

☐ **United States v. Davis** (Argued 04/17/2019)

Is the subsection-specific definition of “crime of violence” in 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(3)(B)—which applies only in the limited context of a federal criminal prosecution for possessing, using or carrying a firearm in connection with acts comprising such a crime—unconstitutionally vague?

Advocates:
Eric J. Feigin, for the petitioner
Brandon E. Beck, for the respondent

Listen to other Supreme Court oral arguments from 1955-Present at Oyez.org

Take Oyez on the road!

Contact Us | Privacy Policy

Unsubscribe From This Newsletter

or unsubscribe from all Justia newsletters immediately **here.**

Justia | 1380 Pear Ave #2B, Mountain View, CA 94043